

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/756,989	01/14/2004	Cressie E. Holcombe	25645-26	3720
75	90 10/27/2005		EXAMINER	
Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
Nexsen Pruet Adams Kleemeier, LLC PO Drawer 10648			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Greenville, SC	• •		1754	
			DATE MAILED: 10/27/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				Ø
,		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/756,989	HOLCOMBE ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Wayne Langel	1754	_
Period fo	- The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address	_
WHIC - Exten after 9 - If NO - Failur Any fo	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)☐ 3)☐	Since this application is in condition for allowa	is action is non-final. ance except for formal ma	-	
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application	on Papers			
9) <u></u> - 10)⊠ -	The specification is objected to by the Examin The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawin	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureate the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment	(s)	•		
1) Notice 2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 'No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/756,989

Art Unit: 1754

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki et al in view of either Pappis et al or Ishii et al. Kawasaki et al disclose a process for manufacturing boron nitride using a pushing furnace. (See col. 8, lines 52-63.) The difference between the process dislosed by Kawasaki etal, and that recited in applicants' claims, is that Kawasaki et al do not disclose that a graphite container should be used for the reaction mixture. Pappis et al disclose a method for making boron nitride, and teach at col. 3, lines 9-15 that the vessel should be formed of a material which can withstand the high temperatures involved, such as graphite. Ishii etv al disclose a method for making boron nitride, and disclose at col. 2, lines 26-42 that the boron material should be placed in a graphite crucible, as graphite is stable against erosion by the atmosphere and the materials under the reducing atmosphere, and it is inexpensive. It would be obvious from Pappis et al to employ a graphite vessel for the reaction mixture in the process of Kawasaki et al, since one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate from Pappis et al that a material such as graphite would be required to withstand the high sintering temperatures disclosed at col. 11, lines 10-50 of Kawasaki et al. It would be obvious from Ishii et al to employ a graphite vessel in the process of Kawasaki et al, since one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to prevent erosion and to reduce costs. hlt is noted that Kawasaki et al disclose a preheating step

Application/Control Number: 10/756,989

Art Unit: 1754

at a temperature of 800 C at col. 13, lines 1-11. Regarding claims 2 and 3, it would be within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art to determine a suitable amount of time to hold the mixture during the preheating and high temperature heating steps. Regarding claim 6, it would be obvious to provide a counterflow of nitrogen in the process of Kawasaki et al to eliminate volatile reaction products so as to avoid contamination of the boron nitride product.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is indefinite as to whether the steps recited in the "whereby" clauses are positive limitations, since the features of these steps would not necessarily result from the positive process steps which are recited. The word "whereby" should be changed to -- wherein -- to avoid this rejection.

Conwell et al is made of record for disclosing the production of abrasive grains in a pusher furnace.

Paine et al '179 and Paine et al "753 are made of record for disclosing the production of boron nitride in graphite furnaces.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Fridays from 8 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/756,989

Art Unit: 1754

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wayné Langel Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1754